

1964

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

no way impair his existing authority, which is quite ample, to enforce the law.

In other words, this bill, taken as a whole, should be called a bill for a vast amount of more Federal power, rather than a civil rights bill.

Mr. President, I feel that the bill is uncalled for, that it cannot be the solution of the problems sought to be reached, and that it will not work.

But, Mr. President, as has been adequately pointed out on several occasions, and as was quite clearly pointed out only yesterday by the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], this measure is a one-sided, sectional bill. On the floor of the Senate, great promises have been made in regard to what would be done in order to treat everyone in the country exactly alike; but the bill does not meet those promises. I predict that over the next period of years, as the Negroes of great Northern, heavily segregated cities, find that they have been exempted from coverage by most of the provisions of the bill, and find that they are going to continue to send their children to segregated schools—schools with segregation that cannot be broken down by court order, because of a provision in this bill forbidding any court to break down those segregated patterns in those schools; and when they find that there cannot be any application of the stiff terms of this Federal law to FEPC problems or to public accommodations problems or to various other problems which may arise—problems which normally would be covered by specific provisions of this bill, except for the exemption written into it—there will be a great wave of discontent among those disillusioned Negroes in the Northern cities. Therefore, I predict that in those Northern cities there will be demonstrations, riots, disturbances, and racial troubles that will go far beyond anything that ever has happened in the South.

Mr. President, it is tragic that this legislation is being imposed upon the people of this country. It is even more tragic that—if it is to be imposed—it is being imposed inequitably, not with equal force upon the people in all sections of the country.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. What is the will of the Senate?

CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, there have been few, if any, occasions when the searching of my conscience and the reexamination of my views of our constitutional system have played a greater part in the determination of my vote than they have on this occasion.

I am unalterably opposed to discrimination or segregation on the basis of race, color, or creed, or on any other basis; not only my words, but more importantly my actions through the years have repeatedly demonstrated the sincerity of my feeling in this regard.

This is fundamentally a matter of the heart. The problems of discrimination can never be cured by laws alone; but I would be the first to agree that laws can help—laws carefully

weighed in an atmosphere of dispassion, in the absence of political demagogery, and in the light of fundamental constitutional principles.

For example, throughout my 12 years as a member of the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee, I have repeatedly offered amendments to bills pertaining to labor that would end discrimination in unions, and repeatedly those amendments have been turned down by the very members of both parties who now so vociferously support the present approach to the solution of our problem. Talk is one thing, action is another, and until the Members of this body and the people of this country realize this, there will be no real solution to the problem we face.

To be sure, a calm environment for the consideration of any law dealing with human relationships is not easily attained—emotions run high, political pressures become great, and objectivity is at a premium. Nevertheless, deliberation and calmness are indispensable to success.

It was in this context that I maintained high hopes for this current legislation—high hopes that, notwithstanding the glaring defects of the measure as it reached us from the other body and the sledge-hammer political tactics which produced it, this legislation, through the actions of what was once considered to be the greatest deliberative body on earth, would emerge in a form both effective for its lofty purposes and acceptable to all freedom-loving people.

It is with great sadness that I realize the nonfulfillment of these high hopes. My hopes were shattered when it became apparent that emotion and political pressures, not persuasion, not commonsense, not deliberation, had become the rule of the day and of the processes of this great body.

One has only to review the defeat of commonsense amendments to this bill—amendments that would in no way harm it but would, in fact, improve it—to realize that political pressure, not persuasion or commonsense, has come to rule the consideration of this measure.

I realize fully that the Federal Government has a responsibility in the field of civil rights. I supported the civil rights bills which were enacted in 1957 and 1960, and my public utterances during the debates on those measures and since reveal clearly the areas in which I feel that Federal responsibility lies and Federal legislation on this subject can be both effective and appropriate. Many of those areas are encompassed in this bill and to that extent, I favor it.

I wish to make myself perfectly clear. The two portions of this bill to which I have constantly and consistently voiced objections, and which are of such overriding significance that they are determinative of my vote on the entire measure, are those which would embark the Federal Government on a regulatory course of action with regard to private enterprise in the area of so-called public ac-

ployment—to be more specific, titles II and VII of the bill. I find no constitutional basis for the exercise of Federal regulatory authority in either of these areas; and I believe the attempted usurpation of such power to be a grave threat to the very essence of our basic system of government; namely, that of a constitutional republic in which 50 sovereign States have reserved to themselves and to the people those powers not specifically granted to the Central or Federal Government.

If it is the wish of the American people that the Federal Government should be granted the power to regulate in these two areas and in the manner contemplated by this bill, then I say that the Constitution should be so amended by the people as to authorize such action in accordance with the procedures for amending the Constitution which that great document itself prescribes. I say further that for this great legislative body to ignore the Constitution and the fundamental concepts of our governmental system is to act in a manner which could ultimately destroy the freedom of all American citizens, including the freedoms of the very persons whose feelings and whose liberties are the major subject of this legislation.

My basic objection to this measure is, therefore, constitutional. But, in addition, I would like to point out to my colleagues in the Senate and to the people of America, regardless of their race, color, or creed, the implications involved in the enforcement of regulatory legislation of this sort. To give genuine effect to the prohibitions of this bill will require the creation of a Federal police force of mammoth proportions. It also bids fair to result in the development of an "informer" psychology in great areas of our national life—neighbors spying on neighbors, workers spying on workers, businessmen spying on businessmen, where those who would harass their fellow citizens for selfish and narrow purposes will have ample inducement to do so. These, the Federal police force and an "informer" psychology, are the hallmarks of the police state and landmarks in the destruction of a free society.

I repeat again: I am unalterably opposed to discrimination of any sort and I believe that though the problem is fundamentally one of the heart, some law can help—but not law that embodies features like these, provisions which fly in the face of the Constitution and which require for their effective execution the creation of a police state. And so, because I am unalterably opposed to any threats to our great system of government and the loss of our God-given liberties, I shall vote "no" on this bill.

This vote will be reluctantly cast, because I had hoped to be able to vote "yea" on this measure as I have on the civil rights bills which have preceded it; but I cannot in good conscience to the oath that I took when assuming office, cast my vote in the affirmative. With the exception of titles II and VII, I could wholeheartedly support this bill; but with their

June 18

the compromise version we have been working on, my vote must be "no."

If my vote is misconstrued, let it be, and let me suffer its consequences. Just let me be judged in this by the real concern I have voiced here and not by words that others may speak or by what others may say about what I think.

My concern extends beyond this single legislative moment. My concern extends beyond any single group in our society. My concern is for the entire Nation, for the freedom of all who live in it and for all who will be born into it.

It is the general welfare that must be considered now, not just the special appeals for special welfare. This is the time to attend to the liberties of all.

This is my concern. And this is where I stand.

RUSSIAN PAYMENT FOR WHEAT

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President I yield myself such time as I may require.

Because of statements made when the Russian wheat sales was under consideration that there were serious questions whether we would ever be paid for the wheat, I continue to get occasional inquiries from citizens who want to know if the Russians are paying up.

I consequently inquired of the Department of Agriculture about the status of the sales. I have a reply which shows that as of June 1 the Continental Grain Co. and Cargill, Inc., had shipped 62.7 million bushels of wheat out of a total of 65.5 million bushels to be shipped and had been paid promptly upon completion of loading and presentation of documents. Payments to June 1 totaled \$133.8 million.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have printed in the Record, a copy of the Department of Agriculture letter setting out this and other information.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D.C., June 17, 1964.

HON. GEORGE McGOVERN,
U.S. Senate.
(Attention: Mr. Ben Stong.)

DEAR SENATOR McGOVERN: This is in reply to your inquiry for information concerning payments in connection with the sale of U.S. wheat to the Soviet Union.

Enclosed are background statements on the two wheat sales concluded with the Soviet Union. These were commercial transactions between the U.S. exporters and the Soviet buying agency. Wheat for these sales could have been procured either from the open market or from Government-owned stocks held by the Commodity Credit Corporation.

The sales were both on cash terms. While commercial credit for these sales could have been guaranteed by the Export-Import Bank, we understand from the exporters that credit was not requested by the Soviet Union in their purchases here. Both U.S. exporters—Continental Grain Co., and Cargill, Inc.—have indicated that payments in dollars on individual cargoes have been received promptly in New York upon completion of loading and presentation of documents. Payments received to June 1 total \$133.8 million. As of that date, a total of 62.7 million bushels of wheat had been exported to the Soviet

Union out of total expected exports, including allowable overage, of 65.5 million bushels.

We are also enclosing a statement on the U.S. wheat supply and distribution which provides further background on these sales. It now appears that our total wheat exports this year will reach 850 million bushels. This would leave a June 30 carryover of approximately 880 million bushels, which is about 300 million bushels lower than a year earlier.

Please let us know if we can be of further service.

Sincerely yours,
DOROTHY H. JACOBSON,
Assistant Secretary.

AN ADDITION TO "THE WEEK THAT IS"

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, yesterday the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. Aiken] reviewed some of the startling developments of the current week under the heading, "The Week That Is."

I was much impressed by the wit of the Senator's satirical effort.

This morning's newspaper carries the news of another development which I think should be added to the list of remarkable events already cataloged by the Senator from Vermont. In the Washington Post of today's date is a story that to some will seem incredible. It is headed simply, "Birch Society Debt Increases."

For years, the John Birch Society has been the Nation's most ardent enemy of deficit financing. Indeed, a high percentage of the Birch Society's barbs have been aimed at those who would dare participate in any kind of program that would increase the Government's debt or its deficit. All the good Birchers tried and true have paraded under the banner of pay-as-you-go fiscal integrity—no debt, no deficit, no default. Yet, here it is in black and white under a Boston dateline of June 17, and I quote:

BIRCH SOCIETY DEBT INCREASES

The John Birch Society went deeper into debt in 1963, a report on file in the State attorney general's office showed today.

The figures indicated a cumulative deficit of \$210,954, compared to a debt of \$84,612 for 1962.

Although expenses and total deficit rose, the militantly conservative organization reported income increase to \$1,043,653 from \$737,716 in 1962.

Mr. President, what could be a more surprising news development to add to "The Week That Is"? For the Birch Society to be caught with a growing debt and a mounting deficit is roughly parallel to Carrie Nation being picked up on a charge of public intoxication. Apparently the Birchers have been fighting the public debt so vigorously that they have forgotten to balance their own books. It only demonstrates again the wisdom of that old adage, "People who live in glass houses shouldn't throw stones."

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

McNAMARA'S WAR

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on the same day that the Senator from South Dakota obtained the floor—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has the floor in his own right; he has been recognized by the Chair.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I think during this lull in the Senate it is very appropriate to discuss another subject matter for a moment. So I have a few comments to make about McNamara's war.

It was not my privilege to be present today in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee when Secretary of State Rusk began the administration's defense of its typically inflated foreign aid program. I was presenting my case before the Committee on the District of Columbia against violating a very precious liberty of freemen; namely, that every arrested person be entitled to be taken without delay before a committing magistrate. This precious safeguard of liberty is known as the Mallory rule based upon a unanimous decision of the U.S. Supreme Court. It is proposed to reverse that decision by the so-called omnibus crime bill. I shall oppose that evil and I argued against it in the District of Columbia Committee this morning. Therefore, I could not hear the testimony this morning of the Secretary of State.

I say, however, that his program is "typically inflated" because all the description of it as a "bare bones" measure cannot disguise the fact that a good third of it is going into military programs that are worthless to the United States and often harmful to the recipient country. We would have a much sounder foreign aid program if we terminated all military aid entirely. Perhaps then we could begin to get results from our economic aid.

It is also a typically inflated foreign aid program because it does not mention our already huge unspent pipeline of foreign aid appropriations that will greatly inflate the \$3.5 billion the President is asking for in his so-called bare bone bill.

Secretary Rusk has made his most audacious attempt to date to present the illegal war in Vietnam over which he helps preside as a useful and desirable venture. It is too bad his statement comes on the same day as the more frank and realistic statements by an anonymous but high-ranking U.S. military adviser who admits that the outlook in Vietnam is much worse now than it was 3 years ago.

It was 3 years ago that McNamara's war began in Vietnam. As a result of the direct U.S. involvement, the situation has deteriorated. In this unattributed statement, the U.S. spokesman admits that "90 percent of the guerrillas' weapons came from the U.S. military assistance program to the South Vietnamese Government forces." I wonder if Secretaries McNamara and Rusk have given any thought to the possibility that by ceasing our military aid we could do more damage to the rebels than we are doing by increasing it because we would deny them their chief source of weapon supply.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an Associated Press article entitled "Vietnam Threat Worse, U.S. Aid in Saigon Says," published in today's

New York Times, be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, "American support—political, economic, and military—continues to be needed," said Secretary Rusk today of South Vietnam. "The Vietnamese Government and people cannot do the job alone. In Malaya it took extensive British assistance and a favorable troop ratio of about 24 to 1 to defeat the Communist guerrillas, and it required a 12-year period to do it."

What a deceitful statement. The Secretary of State knows very well that the Communist guerrillas in Malaya were foreigners—they were Chinese Communists. They were not local people at all. They did not present a civil war, but an infiltration of foreigners.

As such, they were easy to distinguish from the local population. And they did not represent indigenous opinion. It took 12 years to put them down, and thousands of lives.

In South Vietnam, the Americans are the only foreign troops on the scene. In South Vietnam, we are doing very much what Nazi Germany, Fascist Italy, and Communist Russia did in Spain during the Spanish Civil War. We are intervening in someone else's civil war. But this time we are doing it alone.

In Laos, the Secretary of State refers to military assistance we are providing in accordance with the Geneva accords of 1962. He conveniently ignores the military participation of the United States that is in violation of article IV of those accords. It is a shameful record that the United States is making as a violator of international law in Laos, as well as in South Vietnam. We are besmirching the United Nations Charter.

By what twisted and self-serving logic can the United States try to justify its violations of international agreements by pointing to the violations of others? The "he started it" charge has served countless nations as a sufficient pretext for war; it has killed millions of people. It was every nation's excuse for the bloodbath of World War I, and there are even people today who still claim Poland started something in 1939 that Germany had every right to finish.

Today, an American Secretary of State is dishing up the same old pretext for an American war in South Vietnam and Laos. And American boys are being killed illegally, unjustifiably, and, in my judgment, by way of a shocking betrayal of their own Government's obligation to them.

Under every section of the United Nations Charter and under every concept of American international policy, the nation that starts something should be called to account not by the United States but by the United Nations. President Johnson's advisers have sold him on a policy of striking blow for blow in Asia but admitting to nothing.

Such a policy is not only going to lead to disaster but it is also an insult to the American people. One expects to read of the Soviet Union or the Chinese Government liberately concealing its military moves

from its own people who must pay for them and die for them. But it is a sad day when the United States of America is guilty of the same deception.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the Record an editorial from the Aviation Week on this subject, entitled "The Credibility Gap." It is an editorial that takes the Secretary of Defense, Mr. McNamara, and his press officer, Mr. Sylvester, to task for the great gap in their credibility as to the reports that they make to the American people on our operations in southeast Asia.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

THE CREDIBILITY GAP

(By Robert Hotz)

There are disturbing indications that the credibility of Defense Secretary Robert Strange McNamara and his Pentagon spokesmen is diminishing rapidly at the very time President Lyndon Johnson needs it most to build public support for this Nation's campaign to repel communism in southeast Asia.

Lack of credibility of key Government officials is always a serious matter in a democratic society, but the deepening crisis, in Vietnam and Laos, which is certain to demand heavier sacrifices in blood and money from the American people, makes this problem particularly acute now. The American people have never flinched from paying whatever price was necessary to preserve liberty and prevent the spread of tyranny when they understood clearly the issues at stake. But there is diminishing public support for the southeast Asian ventures—at the very time that the crisis is reaching its peak—because of the lessening public belief in the world it is getting from the Pentagon's civilian leaders.

This may prove to be an extremely high price for President Johnson to pay for whatever success Mr. McNamara and his official mouthpiece, Arthur Sylvester, have achieved in their avowed intent to control Pentagon news to suit their own purposes. This policy backfired badly in the Cuban crisis. The sparse and misleading information dispensed from the Pentagon on Cuba reduced public credibility on official statements to such a low point that the late President Kennedy finally had to order Mr. McNamara to put on that extraordinary lantern-slide show on national television to convince the American people that the Soviet missiles were really being shipped out of Cuba. Ironically, this performance revealed more genuine intelligence secrets than would have been necessary if Messrs. McNamara and Sylvester had dispensed the facts as events occurred.

Both Mr. McNamara and Mr. Sylvester came to their Pentagon duties with an unusual belief in the use of the official lie as a national policy instrument. Mr. McNamara first made this clear in 1961 testimony before Congress on the Nike-Zeus when he said:

"Why should we tell Russia that Zeus developments may not be satisfactory? What we ought to be saying is that we have the most perfect anti-ICBM system that the human mind will ever devise." Mr. McNamara probably doesn't see any similarity in the tactics he proposed and Nikita Khrushchev's insistence that the Soviets have perfected an anti-ICBM system that can "hit a fly in the sky," but many Americans will. Mr. Sylvester expounded the right to tell official lies in his now infamous New York Deadline Club speech (AW Dec. 17, 1962, p. 35). Although he then maintained that this basic "right to lie" should be used only to avert nuclear war, he has in fact adopted it as a standard

operational practice. His credibility has sunk so low that most Pentagon reporters really don't believe a story until it has been officially denied. Even his subordinates are apologetic for the more blatant episodes.

During Mr. McNamara's first appearances before Congress, its key leaders were impressed with his ability to answer on the spot any question they asked. It was not until several times around the same track that they began to develop misgivings over the accuracy of many of these answers and began to wonder if the Secretary's talents lay more toward glibness than research. Among the incidents that have shaken his once strong credibility with Congress are:

His claim that forcing U.S. Air Force and Navy to use the same F-111 (TFX) design would save a billion dollars. Later testimony showed that this was a rough calculation made by an aid on the back of an envelope before a contractor was even selected for the project.

The manner in which many of his economy claims for the Defense Department budget have evaporated under congressional scrutiny, and how many of them have simply turned out to be the difference between what might have been spent and what was ordered to be spent.

His public insistence that the Lockheed YF-12A (A-11) was developed from the start as an interceptor for U.S. Air Force, despite knowledge by key Congressmen that this aircraft was sponsored and funded by the Central Intelligence Agency as a super-spy successor to the U-2.

His repeated optimistic reports on the Vietnam war that are regularly contradicted by events occurring on the battlefield. It is ironic that his credibility has sunk so low on this score that even when he is right—as in the case of which aircraft types are proper for this operation—few believe him any more.

As the facts in all of these areas eventually emerge and erode the official position taken by Messrs. McNamara and Sylvester, their efforts to suppress and control the Pentagon information flow become more violent and ridiculous. Mr. Sylvester's internal Pentagon directive to all military public information officers ordering the F-111 to be portrayed publicly as a success regardless of what the facts may be (AW Apr. 27, p. 31) would read more appropriately in the Cyrillic alphabet than in English. The idea of proclaiming that an aircraft will meet all of the military service requirements before the first prototype has rolled out or made its initial flight is so ludicrous it belongs in a George Orwell book. The latest attempt by Mr. Sylvester to further tighten control of military news (AW June 8, p. 20) has been widely interpreted—and we think correctly so—as another indication of how badly the tide is running against our efforts in Vietnam.

Now we have the incredible spectacle of eight U.S. Air Force F-100 fighter bombers making a strike on foreign soil—the first U.S. offensive military action since Korea—and the Government trying to suppress this news and keep it from the American people.

Clearly it is time, not only for a reappraisal of the credibility of Messrs. McNamara and Sylvester, but also for a realistic examination of an official information policy that is widening the gap between a Government and its people at a critical time in the fate of this Nation.

Mr. MORSE. I shall read the last two brief paragraphs:

Now we have the incredible spectacle of eight U.S. Air Force F-100 fighter-bombers making a strike on foreign soil—the first U.S. offensive military action since Korea—and the Government trying to suppress this news and keep it from the American people.

Clearly it is time, not only for a reappraisal of the credibility of Messrs. McNamara and Sylvester, but also for a realistic examination of an official information policy that is widening the gap between a government and its people at a critical time in the fate of this Nation.

The credibility gap is illustrated also by the obvious misrepresentations of the Secretary of State in his testimony this morning in regard to American foreign policy in southeast Asia.

The President seems somewhat concerned that more people are not rising to the defense of his policies in South Vietnam. I am satisfied that as more and more American people discover the lack of justification for America's acts of illegality under international law in South Vietnam, they will register more and more protests against that policy.

Yesterday, I placed in the RECORD a large number of communications which I have received in opposition to the administration's illegal course of action in South Vietnam. A reading of them will show that they come from all over the United States and show a deep resentment concerning our policy in Asia.

I close by pleading with my President once again to live up to our country's obligations under the United Nations Charter, and to proceed forthwith to file a request with the United Nations for the United Nations to take over jurisdiction in southeast Asia. The United States should call upon the United Nations to seek to establish a peacekeeping corps in South Vietnam under the canopy of the United Nations. It offers the world the best hope of bringing an end to the killing and the war in southeast Asia.

I state once more to the American people that if we continue United States policy—and the United States must assume the primary responsibility for what is happening in southeast Asia—we shall run the great danger of forcing Red China into combat. This event could lead to the beginning of a third world war. Starting such a war would be to the everlasting discredit and shame of our country, and would result in the rest of the world hating us for at least 500 years.

Mr. President, it is not too late for the United States to reverse its thinking, and proceed to bring its foreign policy within the framework of international law; in keeping with its obligations when we signed the United Nations Charter, which we are now violating section after section.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the New York Times, June 18, 1964]

VIETCONG THREAT WORSE, U.S. AID IN SAIGON SAYS

SAIGON, SOUTH VIETNAM, June 17.—A ranking U.S. military adviser said today that the Communist threat to South Vietnam was far more serious than it had been when he first came here nearly 3 years ago.

The Vietcong guerrillas, who control much of the countryside, are "much better armed and professionally more competent" today than they were 3 years ago, he said at a news conference before his departure for Washington.

The biggest problem facing the U.S. in South Vietnam, the officer said, is

the problem of getting the Vietnamese Government and army to accept American advice.

He said that the quality of Vietnamese Army personnel had improved since President Ngo Dinh Diem was overthrown last November and that the effectiveness of the Vietnamese Government forces was 50 to 100 percent better than 3 years ago.

"But this rate of improvement was not enough to win the war," he said.

HE MAY NOT BE IDENTIFIED

The officer's outspoken opinions were given to reporters on condition that he not be quoted by name. He was permitted to be identified as a U.S. Army officer of the grade of major or colonel. His comments were similar to informal comments heard from American military advisers in the field but were in sharp contrast to those of official U.S. military spokesmen in Saigon.

The Vietnamese must improve their management and direction of the war," he said. "They need dedicated, competent leaders and must arouse the same high degree of discipline and dedication in the armed forces as the Vietcong have aroused among their guerrillas.

"One of our main problems is to get the Vietnamese to establish some realistic priorities," the officer continued. "The leadership in South Vietnam thinks this war can be settled by political means.

"Politics, corruption, and nepotism are the main Vietnamese vices. Many of the generals here have become generals through political intrigue and not because of their military talent. There are too many second-raters running the war on a provincial level."

The American said that the United States had been trying to persuade the Vietnamese Government to begin a coordinated national campaign plan for 3 years, and that the Government finally accepted the plan only a few months ago.

"Now we have a plan, but it still has to be implemented," he said. "Many of the Vietnamese officers still have done nothing about it. They're still shadowboxing."

The officer, who has served as a senior adviser on the corps level, said the Vietcong had proved more effective than Government troops because of the basic advantage of surprise a guerrilla force enjoys, plus a high sense of discipline.

"This country is right out of the Middle Ages," he said. "The Communists have introduced highly disciplined 19th-century techniques to seize and maintain control. The Vietcong are dedicated, they work at their jobs 7 days a week and 24 hours a day, and they're convinced their cause is right and that they will win."

"If we can arouse the same dedication among the Vietnamese we can win this war," he said.

[From the New York Times, June 18, 1964]

CAMBODIA SANCTUARY CHARGED

SAIGON, June 17.—A senior American military adviser said today that Cambodia was being used as a rest area and supply point for the Vietcong waging war in South Vietnam.

The adviser, who declined to be identified, said that although the Vietcong were hard hit by disease and bad conditions, they got rehabilitation, "and I know some of those rest areas are in Cambodia."

The officer also said that 90 percent of the guerrillas' weapons came from the U.S. military assistance program to the South Vietnamese Government Forces.

He pointed out that the Vietcong made expert and extensive use of mines and explosives. "They've got demolition experts," he said. "And those explosives are coming from Cambodia."

[From the New York Times, June 18, 1964]

VIETCONG DRIVEN OFF

DUCHOA, SOUTH VIETNAM, June 17.—Vietnamese gunners manning two 105-mm. howitzers blasted a Communist Vietcong battalion from Duchoa today after the guerrillas had all but captured this government stronghold 10 miles west of Saigon.

The war's tempo was rising after a relative lull for a month.

About 600 guerrillas hit Duchoa at 3:30 a.m., setting off a 3-hour battle whose sights and sounds carried to Saigon like a thunderstorm on the horizon. The Vietcong was backed by mortars, recoilless rifles and machine guns.

The defenders suffered 51 casualties, including 15 dead.

Nineteen guerrillas were known to have been killed and U.S. advisers estimated the toll may have reached 50 or 60. Most of the Vietcong casualties were carried away on the retreat.

The artillerymen, whose two stubby, American-made 105's helped turn the tide at Duchoa, drew praise from an American officer who arrived on the scene with reinforcements a few hours later.

Operating at times under direct attack and shooting at point-blank range, the two gun crews fired 322 shells in less than an hour.

"It takes a few men with guts to hold out in a thing like this," the U.S. adviser said. "The Vietcong wanted to take his town. They have been bragging about it in leaflets for months. But they underestimated our will to win."

Bodies of guerrillas lay in the main square of Duchoa, a town of 7,000, where they had been cut down while trying to raise a Communist flag. Others, caught by a machine gun, had fallen along a water-filled ditch.

MOST BUILDINGS NICKED

Virtually every concrete building in the town was pockmarked with bullet holes. Blood soaked the muddy earth around the district chief's house, where Vietcong riflemen had massed for an attack on the government's artillery.

The guerrillas appeared to lose heart about 6 a.m. The attack slackened from then until dawn. At 6:30 a.m., defenders moved out of their positions and drew only light sniper fire. This soon ended.

A Ranger battalion summoned from near by checked the surrounding countryside without finding any guerrillas.

However, six Vietnamese—two men, two women and two children—were killed in midmorning by a mine that wrecked a bus on a road a mile east of Duchoa. The Vietcong had apparently laid the mine prior to their attack.

MISSISSIPPI SUMMER

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I yield myself such time as I have remaining to me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator may proceed.

Mr. STENNIS. The invasion of Mississippi this summer by outside racial agitators, primarily under the so-called Mississippi summer project, is sponsored by the Council of Federated Organizations—COFE. This is the official name of the sponsoring group made up of the following: Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee—SNICK; Congress of Racial Equality—CORE; National Association for the Advancement of Colored People—NAACP; and the Southern Christian Leadership Conference—SCLC.

The National Council of Churches has announced adoption of a tentative budget of \$250,000 to support a task force which will go to Mississippi this summer. The National Council of Churches will pay 60 percent of the above cost and the World Council of Churches will pay the remaining 40 percent. Apparently, this money will be contributed to the overall Mississippi summer project, although it could be a separate drive.

In this connection, an article was published in the Wall Street Journal of May 25, 1964, written by Burt Schoor, and entitled "Mississippi Summer—State Appears Ready To Tolerate Peaceful Civil Rights Invasion"; also an editorial published in the Shreveport Journal of March 27, 1964, entitled "Mississippi Marked for New Invasion"; together with an article published in the New York Times of June 14, 1964, written by Claude Sitton and entitled "South Girds for Crisis."

I ask unanimous consent that these items may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial and articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, May 25, 1964]

MISSISSIPPI SUMMER—STATE APPEARS READY TO TOLERATE PEACEFUL CIVIL RIGHTS INVASION—UP TO 1,000 OUTSIDE RECRUITS TO RUN FREEDOM SCHOOLS AND REGISTER NEGRO VOTERS—SOME STILL FEAR BLOODSHED

(By Burt Schoor)

JACKSON, Miss.—Vassar College Sophomore Susan Fimmel, an English literature major whose personal knowledge of the South stems from a 2-week visit there when she was 10, is planning to stay in Mississippi this summer. As a member of the largest civil rights task force ever to converge on this unyielding State, Miss Fimmel has no illusions about what may lie ahead.

"It's quite possible I will go to jail," she says.

However, the outlook for Miss Fimmel and hundreds of other out-of-Staters planning to teach in Negro freedom schools or work on voter registration projects may not be so grim.

There's mounting evidence here in the State's capital that Mississippi officials, rather than attempting to interfere with peaceful activities of civil rights workers, will actually strive to protect them in the interests of preserving order—a mood that is spreading to city and county officials elsewhere in the State. If civil rights strategists here persist in plans to concentrate on voter registration and classroom activities rather than street demonstrations, such a task could be simpler than anyone envisioned a few months ago.

"We don't anticipate any trouble unless they do something like they've done in Cleveland or New York," says the city attorney for an agricultural trading center north of here where police recently permitted some 200 Negroes to congregate outside the local county courthouse during a registration attempt. "If they're going to conduct schools," the city attorney adds, "it seems to me the burden on them is to keep attendance up more than anything."

SOME CLOUDS ON THE HORIZON

While this apparent attitude of relative moderation represents a departure for Mississippi, it could be altered in coming weeks. If the civil rights bill passes Congress with the public accommodations section largely intact, it's expected to arouse nearly total resistance in many parts of this State.

Even without the impact of Federal legislation, Negro youngsters released from high schools, along with local and outside college

students, may be tempted to resume some of last summer's more aggressive protest activities. No one can discount the possibility that a single isolated incident of violence could trigger large-scale rioting and disorder.

Indeed, some here view the hot months ahead with foreboding. "When you consider all the forces at work, this summer could make last summer look like a birthday party," says Paul Anthony, director of field activities of the Southern Regional Council, a biracial organization which closely follows Negro-white relations in the South.

ORGANIZERS ARRESTED

Even now, the calm that prevails here is a relative thing. During the past 2 weeks, civil rights staff people organizing for the summer report there have been more than 25 arrests of fieldworkers. The charges range from improper parking to arrest for investigation of auto theft. A white Antioch (Ohio) College student who was driving back to Jackson from a meeting in Greenwood, Miss., with six fellow workers, all Negroes, had a car breakdown in a small farming town. The group split up in search of a place to sleep. Within an hour, all were in jail as burglary suspects and stayed behind bars until the following afternoon.

Nevertheless, in the high-ceilinged offices of the State capitol here, policies appear to be taking shape that would cast Mississippi in a more tolerant role than that which it played under former Gov. Ross Barnett. The present Governor, Paul B. Johnson, already has received national attention for the surprisingly conciliatory remarks on race in his inaugural address. Even more interesting is the speech he made to the legislature in March which attracted almost no notice outside the State.

Governor Johnson, of course, gives no indication he is about to defect from the segregationist camp. His March address referred to civil rights volunteers as organized revolutionaries who foment strife with the aim of substituting Federal law enforcement authority for State law enforcement authority. To frustrate this threat to States rights, the Governor asked that the State police be increased to 475 men from 275, that a training academy for them be established and that he be given the power (which he now lacks) to use the enlarged force for unrestricted enforcement purposes.

GOVERNOR WARNS VIGILANTES

The bill authorizing the police changes was signed into law Friday. Another bill providing \$4 million to pay for the expansion seems certain to win legislative approval. Confidants of the Governor now are quietly emphasizing that the March speech also promised protection to Negroes and rights volunteers. "No one will have to fear the rise of unlawful paramilitary or vigilante groups" once the new State police powers are voted, the Governor said. This not-so-veiled reference is to the resurgence of night riders in the State's southwestern counties where recent cross burnings and threats against Negroes have troubled responsible whites. According to a reliable source here, one vigilante group even telephoned a threat to Governor Johnson himself not long ago.

"The State police are going to be used to protect anyone, whether white or black, native Mississippian or from out of State, as long as he's keeping the peace," maintains one State official here who's in a position to know. "You might have a situation where local officers refuse to act against our own people who cause violence. The Governor would move in such a case."

Another significant development here has been the fate of a State senate bill that would require all schools to be licensed by the local county school superintendent. The bill of the State of Mississippi would be banned and teachers at unlicensed institutions sub-

ject to a maximum of 6 months in jail and a \$500 fine. The proposed law obviously is aimed at blocking the freedom schools. But State administration forces have quietly buried the bill in committee on advice of Attorney General Joe T. Patterson that it could compromise the State's defense in pending Federal civil rights cases.

A still more important reason for believing Mississippi's reception of outsiders could prove kinder than forecast earlier is the somewhat less militant stand in recent weeks of the Council of Federated Organizations (COFO), the group coordinating civil rights activities in this State. It's staffed chiefly by members of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (SNCC), the most militant of the major civil rights groups. COFO said earlier this year it was calling for an invasion of Mississippi by 2,000 volunteers. SNCC Chairman John Lewis said the aim was to saturate the State with voter registration workers, cause mass arrests, and force Federal intervention.

It appears now, however, that far fewer volunteers will be on hand than first anticipated, perhaps less than 1,000. Dr. Staughton Lynd, a history professor at Spelman College in Atlanta and codirector of the freedom schools, calculates that only some 350 volunteer teachers will be needed to instruct the approximately 1,000 local Negro teenagers expected to enroll at 24 locations around the State.

The youngsters, using Negro churches and meeting halls, will study such topics as Negro history and the impact of race relations on Southern politics, subjects widely skirted by public schools here. They'll also receive remedial help in such areas as reading and composition. When the schools wind up in August, it's hoped students will carry on as civil rights cadres in their communities.

Another 600 to 700 volunteers are expected to work on other COFO projects, including one to obtain signatures of 400,000 Negroes to carry to the Democratic national convention as a protest against discriminatory voting barriers in the State.

One factor holding down the total number of those accepted for civil rights work in the State is the relatively small number of Negroes who have applied. "There has been growing concern in SNCC that too many Northern whites are doing work that should be left to Negroes," says a white COFO fieldworker at the organization's bustling headquarters in a former Negro radio station here.

REJECTION OF WHITES?

Some 825 applications have been received from prospective volunteers thus far, but only about 15 percent of them from Negroes. Thus, whites may have to be rejected to keep the number of Negroes on COFO field projects close to the desired 40 percent ratio.

"We had plans to subsidize Negro undergraduates who often have to earn their next year's tuition by working at summer jobs," says Professor Lynd. "But the funds we were hoping to get haven't materialized as yet. The proportion of whites teaching in the schools is going to be higher than we thought, and from the standpoint of a thoroughly integrated staff as an example to the students, it could prove disastrously high."

Within COFO, a debate on what roles students and teachers at the freedom schools should play in Negro protest activities apparently has been resolved in favor of deemphasizing such activities. Plans originally called for students to be available for other COFO projects during the afternoons. But the academic day now is scheduled to run until 5 p.m., leaving less time for such work.

"There may be times when a class will feel the necessity of becoming involved in a local situation," says a school administrator for COFO. "But the objective of the students will be to learn and demonstrations will not be encouraged or urged."

June 18

13830

OHIO IS STAGING AREA

The schools also will avoid dangerous rural counties where the sight of white teachers boarding with Negro families might be expected to stir local passions. And to help insure that summer workers don't undertake spur-of-the-moment protest activities, volunteers are expected to attend orientation sessions at Western College for Women, Oxford, Ohio, before moving on in small groups to assigned posts in Mississippi.

Applicants, too, are being screened by interviewers, many of them college faculty members; the National Council of Churches hopes to recruit some 75 ministers who will act as counselors to both volunteers and local students in Mississippi communities. COFO's own "guidelines for interviewing," cite the example of a recent volunteer who hotheadedly insisted on working in Yazoo City, a delta town that COFO leaders consider dangerous to enter, against the advice of his project director. He was finally assigned to Jackson headquarters.

If the problem presented by this volunteer were multiplied enough times, the guidelines warn, the whole program could be jeopardized and lives could even be lost. It adds, "A student who seems determined to carve his own niche and win publicity and glory when he returns home can only have harmful effects on the Mississippi program."

[From the Shreveport Journal, Mar. 27, 1964]

MISSISSIPPI MARKED FOR NEW INVASION

Citizens of Mississippi have been warned to expect a bloody assault upon their State this summer by the National Council of Churches, the World Council of Churches, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, the Student Non-violent Coordinating Committee and other integrationist, race-agitating groups.

The National Council of Churches has announced it will send a "task force" of men and money into the Mississippi Delta to wage war on what it describes as "persistent" poverty and racial injustice. The Delta project will call for a tentative annual budget of \$250,000, with the National Council paying for 80 percent of the cost and the World Council picking up the tab for the remaining 40 percent. Officials of the National Council of Churches are entering into this project with the frank acknowledgment that they expect to become involved—on the Negroes' side—in clashes between white and Negro residents of Mississippi.

Complementing this racial agitation will be what the Harvard Crimson, Harvard University's daily newspaper, has described as an invasion by militant young Negroes of the NAACP and the SNCC. In its issue of March 11, the Crimson attributes to Claude Weaver, SNCC worker and Harvard student recently released from jail in Jackson, a statement that "Negroes might start killing the white people in Mississippi pretty soon."

"Yes," Weaver is quoted as saying, "if we wanted to get a small Mau Mau going, it wouldn't be difficult. Might be a nice summer project."

In an editorial of March 12, the Crimson speculates upon the coming invasion of Mississippi as follows:

"This summer will witness a massive, daring, probably bloody, assault on the racial barriers of Mississippi.

"The 1964 plan calls for an invasion of over 1,000 Peace Corps type volunteers, in order to shake Mississippi out of the Middle Ages.

"Where former projects concentrated on a specific grievance, such as voting or public accommodations, this summer's effort will cover the whole field."

Freedom schools, stressing political education and the humanities, will be established in Negro areas. The project also provides for special community centers staffed by nurses, librarians, and social workers. Still more ambitious is the white community project, designed to organize poor white areas in order to eliminate bigotry, poverty, and ignorance.

"And, for the first time, active self-defense and actual retaliation, though not officially advocated, are being openly discussed."

"Civil rights leaders carefully weighed the possible consequences of the radical changes before endorsing them. They knew the program would alienate some northern white moderates, but they argued, and argued rightly, there is no other way to liberate Mississippi. Mississippi is the only State where a majority of whites don't consider desegregation 'inevitable.' Remembering that Reconstruction lasted only 17 years, Mississippians plan to resist until the North again tires of crusading."

"Central to the project is the anticipated lawlessness of Mississippi whites. The planners reason that massive nonviolence will precipitate a crisis of violence, which they consider prerequisite for further progress. Understandably, such candid reasoning disturbs moderates torn between respect for civil tranquillity and support for civil rights. In this case, however, rights and tranquillity are not compatible."

So there you have it. There is the explanation of why the National Council of Churches is lobbying alongside the NAACP for passage of the infamous civil rights bill in the Senate today.

No longer content to sponsor such mild interracial activities as its annual observance of "Race Relations Sunday," the National Council of Churches now espouses an integrationist movement which it expects to end in violence.

If your church is a member of the NCC, part of every church donation you make will be used to finance this racial strife. Is this what you want?

[From the New York Times, June 14, 1964]
 SOUTH GIDS FOR CRISIS—MASSIVE ASSAULT ON RACIAL BARRIERS PLANNED FOR THIS SUMMER CREATES ATMOSPHERE OF TENSION

(By Claude Sitton)

JACKSON, Miss., June 13.—Whites and Negroes in the Deep South are braced for the social upheaval that they see as the inevitable accompaniment to a summer-long civil rights campaign. But the outcome may be far less violent than either side is now predicting and considerably more inconclusive.

The potential for serious conflict already has been demonstrated at such widely separate points as St. Augustine, Fla., and Canton, Miss. Intermittent terrorism plagues some areas of southwestern Mississippi. Other crises appear to be developing elsewhere.

The plans of civil rights advocates for this massive assault on racial barriers and the preparations of their opponents surpass anything seen in the decade since the Supreme Court's ruling against public school segregation.

However, some important differences from the pattern of the past have emerged. Negroes appear less inclined to take part in the type of large-scale demonstrations that have evoked a riotous response from whites.

RECENT PATTERN

If mass violence does take place, it is generally expected to involve civil rights demonstrators and the police rather than white mobs. This has been the pattern in recent months.

Such outbursts usually develop from action given by authorities for prohibiting protests. It is that this is necessary to prevent violence.

However, in most—but not all—cases in the Deep South, the threat of violence has come from the likelihood that demonstrations would cause a white mob to form.

The prohibition removes the target of potential aggression rather than the would-be aggressors. Thus civil rights advocates contend, the police are doing the work of the mob and in some cases they are not less brutal and by far more effective.

This is by no means true of all southern law-enforcement agencies. Some of them have shown themselves to be well-disciplined and fair in the face of extreme provocation despite the blanket accusations made against them.

AVOIDING VIOLENCE

Officials show an ability and a desire to avoid violence. This does not represent true progress in most cases because the announced method for achieving this goal is rigid enforcement of laws of dubious constitutionality and the suspension, where civil rights workers are involved, of the guarantees of freedom of speech and assembly.

Even the assurance of repressive law enforcement has failed to calm the fears of whites in some areas. Much of their anxiety results from rumor and misunderstanding. But it is nonetheless real.

The depth of this misunderstanding and apprehension is reflected in the reaction of many white Mississippians to the coming freedom summer operation. The project calls for a statewide program of voter registration drives, special academic training for Negro youths, adult citizenship classes, political action, a survey of the State's political and economic structure and a study of white attitudes.

SUPPORT EXPECTED

It is largely the brainchild of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, which is working with local chapters of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, the Congress of Racial Equality and the Southern Christian Leadership Conference. Support is expected from the National Council of Churches, the national NAACP, the NAACP legal defense and educational fund and the National Lawyers Guild.

Approximately 700 student volunteers from throughout the Nation are scheduled to begin arriving by June 22 after undergoing orientation at Western College for Women at Oxford, Ohio.

The atmosphere that has developed among whites in advance of this influx resembles that pervading the State before the desegregation of the University of Mississippi. Whites refer to it as "the invasion." More than a score of new laws have been passed to combat it. The strength of the State highway patrol has been almost doubled and Gov. Paul B. Johnson, Jr., has been given authority to employ troopers anywhere. County and city law enforcement agencies have added new men and equipment, and have developed riot-trained auxiliary units.

VIGILANTE GROUPS

Vigilante groups have sprung up across central and southern Mississippi. The State's long-dormant Ku Klux Klan has experienced a resurgence.

In recent weeks, countless rumors have been circulating. These spurious reports range from one involving a planned mass assault on white women to another that cooks were polluting food. So rife have they become that the Jackson Daily News, in a front page editorial, has urged its readers to ignore them. The tenor of thought in some circles is reflected in a letter from a Jackson resident published subsequently by that newspaper. It said in part:

"It is incredibly criminal and cowardly for a group calling themselves the Council for a group calling themselves the Council to prepare a blood bath that would invite a death-dealing shower of hot lead. Have

these Marxist-mannered ministers who plan to flood our State with their guerrillas never heard of the Scripture, which warns, "Whatsoever ye sow, that shall ye also reap?" We are glad that they served notice of their intention to bathe us in blood, otherwise we might not have been ready for our bath."

Elsewhere in the Deep South, reaction to the summer campaign has followed more conventional lines—increased police preparation, more frequent gatherings of the Ku Klux Klan and similar organizations and a barrage of statements from white leaders against civil rights workers.

The chief targets of the expected activity outside of Mississippi are Alabama and eastern Louisiana.

The Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., and his Southern Christian Leadership Conference are pressing a drive against discrimination in public accommodations and employment at St. Augustine. While the Atlanta integration leader has vowed to remain there until major progress is achieved, observers believe the chief focus of the SCLC will soon shift to Alabama.

FREEDOM ARMIES

Dr. King's aids are now recruiting volunteers for so-called freedom armies in Birmingham and Montgomery, Ala. The absence of mass demonstrations in those cities and the relatively small turnout for the St. Augustine protests seem to reflect a lack of enthusiasm for this tactic.

The Congress of Racial Equality has established a headquarters in New Orleans under Richard Haley, its associate national director, to supervise the Louisiana campaign. It plans to put 48 workers into the field to organize voter registration drives and other projects in addition to those already underway.

The NAACP and the NAACP legal defense and educational fund will continue their work throughout the region and provide assistance to the other organizations in the concentrated campaign in the Deep South. Various registration drives sponsored by the Southern Regional Council voter education project will be carried on without letup.

Needless to say, passage of the civil rights bill now before the Senate will have little effect on the summer's events in these areas of bitter-end resistance to racial change. This may not be true of the South as a whole, however.

The outlook in other areas of the region is summed up, perhaps, in a remark by Burke Marshall, chief of the Justice Department's Civil Rights Division.

MASSIVE RESISTANCE

"A great deal of emphasis now is on the problems that people see for the summer," he said. "But I think that in contrast to the massive resistance of the summers of 1954 and 1955, this is going to be a summer of massive compliance with the new civil rights law, especially the public accommodations section."

It remains to be seen whether this optimism is justified. Much will depend upon the leadership provided by President Johnson, the debate and the outcome of the Presidential campaign and the success of efforts to end discrimination and interracial violence outside the South.

Probably the best that can be hoped for realistically in the Deep South's pockets of defiance until these hurdles are cleared is a peaceful stalemate. There can be no substantial, lasting progress here so long as whites see signs of hope elsewhere that the Nation will eventually tire of the civil rights controversy and leave them to resolve the issue in their own way, as was done in 1877.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, about a year ago, on May 1, 1963, the President of the United States entered an order directing that approximately 3,000 specially trained riot-control troops be

sent to the Birmingham, Ala., vicinity. He did this in spite of assurances by State officials that the local authorities were capable of handling the disturbances created as the result of the provocative activities of outside agitators during the 2 days prior to that time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RIBICOFF in the chair). The time of the Senator from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the remainder of my remarks printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remainder of the remarks was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

At that time, on May 21, 1963, I addressed the Senate and pointed out, as follows:

"The pattern of activities is clear. The agitators move into a peaceful community, hold meetings, make speeches, organize demonstrations, and otherwise play upon the emotions of both races and excite them to a fever pitch. The actions almost inevitably produce a powder keg situation in which riots, violence, and even bloodshed become almost inevitable.

"When this point is reached it then becomes necessary for the local law enforcement officials to take action to maintain law and order. The actions of the law officers in putting down the disturbances result in appeals to Washington for Federal intervention. These appeals—regardless of the merits—all too often receive a preconceived and sympathetic response."

Already these racial zealots are making their move which they hope will lead to the military occupation this summer of Mississippi and, perhaps, other Southern States. They have announced an elaborate so-called Mississippi summer project with plans to recruit and import young college students of both races into Mississippi, ostensibly for the purpose of helping to educate Mississippi Negroes and to assist them in complying with the requirements of law in order to register to vote. Perhaps the young people who have so anxiously accepted this challenging assignment honestly feel that they have enlisted in a worthy cause. But they are sadly mistaken. They are being used. They are being used as a tool in a much broader plan which those in charge hope will result in the complete takeover of Mississippi by the Federal Government.

Already they have had meetings here in Washington, attempting to build up public support for the sending of troops to Mississippi for the so-called purpose of protecting the swarm of recruits being sent to Mississippi to hold these meetings. Regardless of the announced purpose of this excursion, these groups will move into peaceful Mississippi communities, conduct meetings, make speeches, stir up the local citizens of both races, and otherwise provoke and incite incidents and trouble.

Already Members of Congress have fallen for this scheme. They have taken the bait. They have made public statements calling on the President to assure protection to these people going to Mississippi this summer. By protection I assume they want troops.

Already some ministers are busy. I was appalled to see on a Washington television station Sunday morning, June 14, a locally produced program sponsored by the National Capital Council of Churches. The minister who served as moderator interviewed several people, two of whom have enlisted in the army of zealots going to Mississippi this summer. The other person interviewed was a Negro who bragged about the fact that he was a veteran of the so-called freedom ride down from Washington to Nashville, to Montgomery, and to Jackson, Miss. He said that others could help by writing to the Attorney General and the President and urging

ing them to give protection to those going to Mississippi this summer as a part of the so-called summer project.

The minister who conducted the interview did not even try to conceal his glee and enthusiasm that a State of this Union was to be invaded this summer like it was some foreign country and we were in the midst of all-out war. He took up the call and urged his television audience to write to the President and the Attorney General and insist that these people be protected.

CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, the time for decision is at hand. Statements have been made and credible evidence has been presented to indicate that we are moving much more rapidly toward a conclusion on the civil rights issue than many of us would have expected only a few days ago.

Mr. President, I shall vote for the bill now pending before the Senate. I have come to the conclusion and the conviction that it is a moderate bill, one which holds great promise of substantial accomplishment in this troubled area of human relationships.

Mr. President, I voted for cloture. I did so with some degree of reluctance because philosophically I have an abiding belief in the validity of free debate in the Senate. We dwell too much, it seems to me, in these times, when the filibuster is considered only in terms of civil rights; but in many glorious days of the past the right of unlimited debate in the Senate on other progressive issues has meant much for the welfare of the country.

I voted for cloture only when the time came when I believed everything which needed to be said about the bill had been said. If I had been invited to cast a vote to break that filibuster at the end of a month's debate, I should have rejected it because I did not believe at that time that the subject had been fully discussed—even though to many the discussion had seemed to be reasonably adequate.

I believe it is pertinent to note, as so many before me have noted, that Senators in opposition to the bill were always germane in their arguments against it. No side issues were brought in for discussion. The opposition centered solely and exclusively upon the issue at hand. That issue was exhaustively explored, and when the time came to vote on whether cloture should be imposed, it seemed clear to me that an affirmative vote was not out of order, and I cast my vote accordingly.

I have been reluctant to vote for cloture for the reason that I have already mentioned—namely, the belief that unlimited debate has been useful, helpful, and even important in the past history of our Nation.

I freely confess that I have been against cloture philosophically, because I come from a State with a small population, and freedom of debate for such States is, as it always has been, of utmost consequence.

As my period of service here to vote, ever, for a proposal which would bring cloture into effect by a simple majority vote. Let the Senate remain as the one parliament

June 18

13832

in the world, so far as my knowledge runs, where the minority can make its voice heard effectively; this is my unchangeable opinion.

However that may be, the issue is now squarely joined. As I said at the outset, the time for decision is near. More properly and more factually, perhaps, I should have said that the time to record that decision is close upon us, for I am sure each Senator has already decided and is ready to register that decision. That time will come tonight or tomorrow. One need not be a prophet to predict that the bill will be passed by the Senate. I shall not go into exhaustive consideration of all my reasons for voting for the bill. But one reason I do wish to state specifically, because it has been mentioned on the floor of the Senate this afternoon and has been mentioned numberless times heretofore. One of the principal reasons why I propose to vote for the bill is that it contains a public accommodations section. I believe that to be an arch stone of the bill.

I am a member of the Commerce Committee. For several weeks the Commerce Committee held hearings upon a separate public accommodations bill before that part of the civil rights bill was put into the so-called package. At that time I became persuaded and was left with no doubt whatever that such a Federal act is not only justified, but necessary.

I have one memory that abides with me out of many, one that impressed itself particularly upon me during the Commerce Committee hearings. That was when Mr. Roy Wilkins, a Negro—intelligent, well dressed, and known personally by many Senators—came before the committee and described the agonies and embarrassments his wife and he suffered while they were seeking to make a transcontinental automobile trip.

That sort of thing should not be permitted to happen to anyone in this country. I made up my mind then and there I should do my part to prevent its happening in the future.

I do not know whether the desired changes will come overnight if the bill becomes law, but I am absolutely convinced that the situation will be vastly improved, and soon.

I do not wish to close these remarks without alluding to the Senators from the South who have opposed the bill. For these men I have great respect. I had that respect long before I ever entered this body. I have it now. I shall continue to have it. In my judgment, although they were badly outnumbered, although their army was numerically very inferior to the one that opposed them, they fought valiantly and well and cleanly. They represented what they considered to be the best interests of their constituents. They have a deep belief, in my opinion, in the validity of the arguments they presented to the Senate. To them I wish only to say that even if they and I should differ on this particular issue, I want them to know that I think they are men of vision, of rare ability. For their

cause they fought a great fight, and I honor them for their valor in their fight, even though I was obliged to be on the opposite side.

My own State of Alaska has laws intended to provide equality among the races. Those laws have been in effect for about a quarter of a century. They have brought vast improvements. Very few cases arising from those laws have gone to court. The mere presence of the laws on the books of the then Territory and now State of Alaska has sufficed to improve conditions which in many cases were urgently in need of improvement.

I do not assert that those laws have provided all the beneficial results that we should desire in the field of human relationships. They have not. Neither will the bill upon which we are now acting do that.

A century ago the foundation was laid for equal treatment of Americans of whatever race. That foundation crumbled and virtually disappeared. This bill seeks to reestablish it, to build it strong and to build it sure, so that upon it can be erected the kind of edifice of respect for every American citizen that all of us should desire.

It will provide a blueprint, at least, for the future.

We shall have racial difficulties after the bill is signed into law. Let us not deceive ourselves about that.

This bill will not be a cure-all. However, it represents a significant step forward, in my judgment. I do not fear, as some apparently fear, that it will place within the Federal Government vast powers that will cause the Federal Government to become a police state.

Let us remember that we are the Federal Government. The Federal Government is not operated by tyrants whose capital place is in some distant land, whose officers care nothing about the American people, and whose aim is only to oppress them and beat them down and trample them under foot. Indeed not. In many cases the same people who have written me opposing the bill we are now considering, because they said it would mean a police state in this country and give the Federal bureaucracy untrammelled rights to do that which it pleases all over the land, have also written me urgently suggesting that the Federal Government be given some vast new powers which would make life more leisurely and more comfortable and more profitable for them.

So we operate in this Republic under a democratic form of government. The Federal Government, in the long run, does exactly what the majority of the people, operating through their Congress, desire to have done. The evidence is clear that in the present situation a large majority of the American people desire legislation on civil rights in the hope and belief that the passage of the bill will improve racial relationships.

I concur in that judgment. Because of that concurrence, and because I so deeply believe that we as a people are now certainly required to do every thing we ought to do to make every American

citizen equal in every way, my decision long since was made to vote for the bill.

COMMENT ON COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS BY DR. CHARLES S. CAMERON, PRESIDENT OF HAHNEMANN MEDICAL COLLEGE, TO GRADUATING CLASS

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes.

It was my privilege to attend the commencement exercises of Hahnemann Medical College in Philadelphia on June 4, 1964, and the 117th of its long and distinguished history. This great medical institution has given to the world 7,200 doctors as graduates from its course.

The president of Hahnemann Medical College—Dr. Charles S. Cameron—is a most remarkable man of deep understanding. He has the kind of understanding that all doctors could well emulate. He projected that understanding in his charge to the members of the graduating class.

I was especially struck by the tone and spirit of the charge he made to the graduating class—because it involved the field of medical science and research. This is a field on which I have concentrated legislative appropriation efforts for a decade now.

President Cameron prefaced his charge with observations of the great medical discoveries and applications of those discoveries in the comparatively recent past—the products of medical research and medical science—such as penicillin, antibiotics, antihypertensive or anticoagulant drugs, cortisone, antihistamines, tetanus toxoid, polio vaccine, tranquilizing drugs, heart surgery.

He then observed that "this unprecedented measure of mastery over illness is not without one important hazard—the displacement—downgrading might be a better word—the downgrading of the art of medicine at the hand of science."

Then he made his telling point that with all of this great advance in medical research and science, still the most important factor is for the doctors to have a deep feeling for their patients—to have a heart for their patients rather than taking a completely detached scientific attitude toward patients and letting medical science do the job. He put it most eloquently in saying:

The art of medicine is the heart of medicine, and to be more specific it is the heart of the doctor. It is beyond sympathy, that is, feeling sorry for the patient. It is empathy—feeling with the patient. It is giving something of your spirit as well as something in the ampoule. Empathy will not cure pneumonia as effectively as penicillin will, but there are components of every illness which it alone will manage. Recognize it for the good medicine it is and will always be, no matter what wonders science will work in the years to come.

Mr. President, I recommend the words of Dr. Cameron to all medical scientists, researchers, and doctors. I think that the National Institutes of Health and these words of Dr. Cameron—and I particularly call